

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/750,052	Applicant(s) GROVE ET AL.	
	Examiner Yogesh C. Garg	Art Unit 3625	

All Participants:

(1) Yogesh C. Garg.

(2) Karen L. Kaufman.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2010

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner suggested to amend claim 51 by adding the term "non-transitory" in the first line of the preamble of claim 51 after letter "A" and before the letter "machine"; amend claim 87 by adding the phrase "executed from a memory by a processor" in the third line of claim 87 after the word "process" and before the word "lowering", and cancel claim 116 to place the instant application in condition for allowance. The Applicant's attorney Karen Kaufman agreed for issuing this Examiner's Amendment.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Yogesh C Garg/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)